

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/762,197	01/20/2004	John B. Langley	012.P6002	2497	
43831	7590 12/09/2005		EXAMINER		
BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP 1700NW 167TH PLACE			PEZZLO	PEZZLO, JOHN	
SUITE 240	111121102		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BEAVERTO	N, OR 97006		2662	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/762,197	LANGLEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Pezzlo	2662	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 No. This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-37 and 54 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-37 and 54 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 100 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to by the Examine 100 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to be objected	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>22 July 2005</u> .	6) Other:	anom reprincation (i 10-102)	

Art Unit: 2662

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2 of the specification, line 11 states "06/119,225" should be corrected to read -- 60/119,225 --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: Use of the words "capable of" in lines 3 and 4 need to be removed. Since these words render the claim indefinite.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 2, 15, 24, 28, 30, 34, 36, and 54 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,122 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the instant application and the patent are directed to claims, which a first frequency transmitting a first PPM signal and a second frequency transmitting a second PPM signal and both signals are encoded. The instant application does not expressly disclose that the transmitted data is alternatively encoded. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art to alternatively transmit the encoded data between the two frequencies using the PPM. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the claims state to at least in part encode data in the first PPM and the second PPM, which would provide the data with more immunity to nose and interference.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Wrigley (US 3,626,379) discloses a universal data acquisition and control system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Pezzlo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C.

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Jefferson Building

2A15

500 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA, 22313.

John Pezzlo

7 December 2005

JOHN PEZZLO

DEMARY EXAMINER